

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claims 23 and 26, claims 20 to 22, 24, 25, and 27 to 38 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Rejection of Claims 20 to 24, 27, 30, and 36 to 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 20 to 24, 27, 30, and 36 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,276,339 ("Shebert, Jr. et al."). As an initial matter, claim 23 has been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection with respect to claim 23. It is respectfully submitted that Shebert does not anticipate the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20, as presented, relates to a support element comprising a *clamp*, clips, and a bracket, in which the fuel injector protrudes through a hole therein, and in which *an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor*.

Shebert does not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 20, as presented. Nowhere does Shebert disclose a clamp in which an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor, as provided for in the context of claim 20. Shebert indicates a spring clip assembly with two sets of elongate fingers. At most, Shebert indicates two sets of clips, one set of elongate fingers engaging the fuel injector, and the other set of elongate fingers engaging the fuel rail. Even if one of these sets of clips may be considered a clamp, which is not conceded, Shebert merely indicates that reverse bend portions of the elongate fingers engage a flange of the fuel injector, or a plurality of flats of the fuel rail. (Shebert, col. 3, lines 34 to 38). Thus, Shebert does not disclose a clamp in which an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against

one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor. Further, as a result, the elongate fingers of Shebert exert radial forces on both the fuel injector and the fuel distributor. In contrast, the present application specifically states that the support element does not exert any radial force on the fuel injector or the fuel distributor. (Substitute Specification, p. 2, lines 4 to 9). Therefore, Shebert does not disclose, or even suggest, a clamp in which an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor, as provided for in the context of claim 20, as presented.

Accordingly, Shebert does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 20, as presented. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Shebert does not anticipate claim 20.

As for claims 21, 22, 24, 27, 30, and 36 to 38, which ultimately depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 20, as presented, it is respectfully submitted that Shebert does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 20 to 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 20 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,970,953 ("Lorraine et al."). As an initial matter, claims 23 and 26 have been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection with respect to claims 23 and 26. It is respectfully submitted that Lorraine does not anticipate the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20, as presented, relates to a support element comprising a *clamp*, clips, and a bracket, in which the fuel injector protrudes through a hole therein, and in which *an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor*.

Lorraine does not identically disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 20, as presented. Nowhere does Lorraine disclose a clamp in which an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor, as provided for in the context of claim 20. In Figures 3 and 4, Lorraine indicates an injector clip with elongate fingers, and spaced legs. (Lorraine, col. 3, lines 36 to 60). Lorraine indicates that the clip "includes spaced

legs 142, 144 for engaging slots 148 in the injector body.” (Lorraine, col. 3, lines 50 to 52; Figure 3). Further, the clip of Figures 5 and 6 of Lorraine includes, in addition to the features of the clip of Figures 3 and 4 of Lorraine, wall portions to engage the fuel rail. (Lorraine, col. 3, line 67, to col. 4, line 2). Thus, Lorraine indicates that the spaced legs 242, 244 engage slots in the injector body in Figures 5 and 6 as well. As a result, Lorraine does not disclose a clamp in which an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor, since Lorraine only indicates that the spaced legs engage slots in the injector body. Therefore, Lorraine does not disclose, or even suggest, a clamp in which an edge of the clamp rests circumferentially against one of the fuel injector and the fuel distributor, as provided for in the context of claim 20, as presented.

Accordingly, Lorraine does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 20, as presented. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Lorraine does not anticipate claim 20.

As for claims 21, 22, 24, 25, and 27 to 38, which ultimately depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 20, as presented, it is respectfully submitted that Lorraine does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan. 7, 2008

By:

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952 *per 42,124*

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646